

Examiner-Initiated Interview Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/723,428	MONSKI ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Tiffany A. Fetzner	2859	

All Participants:

(1) Tiffany A. Fetzner.

(2) James R. Stevenson Reg. No. 38,755.

Date of Interview: 1 December 2005

Status of Application: Amended

(3) _____

(4) _____

Time: 3pm

Type of Interview:

☒ Telephonic

☐ Video Conference

☐ Personal (Copy given to: ☐ Applicant ☐ Applicant's representative)

Exhibit Shown or Demonstrated: ☐ Yes ☒ No

If Yes, provide a brief description:

Part I.

Rejection(s) discussed:

None

Claims discussed:

Independent claims 99, 117, 140, 163 and 172

Prior art documents discussed:

See Continuation Sheet

Part II.

SUBSTANCE OF INTERVIEW DESCRIBING THE GENERAL NATURE OF WHAT WAS DISCUSSED:

See Continuation Sheet

Part III.

☒ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview directly resulted in the allowance of the application. The examiner will provide a written summary of the substance of the interview in the Notice of Allowability.

☐ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview did not result in resolution of all issues. A brief summary by the examiner appears in Part II above.

(Examiner/SPE Signature)

(Applicant/Applicant's Representative Signature – if appropriate)

Continuation of Identification of prior art discussed: Bock et al., US Patent Application Publication 2002/0156362 A1 published October 24th 2002; Bock et al., US patent 6,549, 799 B2 issued April 15th 2003, filed April 18th 2001. Srinivasan US patent references 6,850,064 B1 filed November 22nd 2000; and US patent 5,664,568 where the limitation of "each coil being partially overlapped" is lacking from figures 9 and 10 as there are neighboring components which are not overlapped with one another, as required in applicant's claimed MRI coil structure. .

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was discussed: The examiner contacted applicant's representative to discuss concerns over the prior art of record, and the Bock et al., references cited above because there was ambiguity over what determined the "primary resonance structures' the "partial overlap" structurally and overall clarification of applicant's claimed structure was needed. Applicant's representative and the examiner discussed the issues, structural differences, etc., as well as how to clarify the applicant's inventive structure over prior art coil configurations with a different structural arrangement. The applicant's representative submitted proposed claim amendments for the examiner to enter by examiner's amendment, as well as a statement of how the instant application differed from other applications by one or more common inventors which are also prior art to the instant application. The applicant's statement of differences is attached to the examiner's amendment. The examiner was thanked for her efforts to place the application in condition for allowance..